arXiv:1603.09492v1 [math.OC] 31 Mar 2016

Frame-based Approach for Sparse Representation of Signal Decomposition and Reconstruction

Wen-Liang Hwang

Abstract

Frame is the corner stone for designing decomposition and reconstruction operations in signal processing. Famous frames include wavelets, curvelets, and Gabor. A celebrated result indicates that if a synthesis frame is chosen for reconstruction, then its canonical dual frame is the analysis frame that performs decomposition, yielding coefficients that minimizes l_2-norm of all coefficients of all dual frames. This paper tries to extend this result by investigating whether a dual frame can be constructed so that the corresponding coefficients yield the minimum l_1-norm. We show that this mission cannot be achieved for any over-complete frame. However, we present some conditions on a dual frame so that the minimizer of the l_1-norm can be derived from the coefficients of the dual frame. We show that, based on frame structure, various applications that seek to optimize sparse analysis and synthesis coefficients are logically equivalent. Finally, we present a general construction method of frames to demonstrate the proposed conditions are feasible. In addition, two design approaches are proposed to derive frames that meet the proposed conditions and yield small non-zero elements of frame coefficients.

1 Introduction

Signal representation is an indispensable component of signal processing on which the familiar procedures of decomposition, processing, and reconstruction of a signal are based [1]. The decomposition and reconstruction are also referred to as analysis and synthesis, respectively. A signal is first mapped as a vector of coefficients in transform domain by a decomposition operation. The coefficients are then modified

and mapped to the signal space by a reconstruction operation. A crucial criterion for the design of decomposition and reconstruction operations is the perfect reconstruction of any signal [2, 3]. The composition of the reconstruction operation after the decomposition operation must be an identity operation. Frame is a branch of mathematics that studies how to design the decomposition and reconstruction operations to reach the perfect reconstruction for any signal in a vector space [4, 5, 6, 7]. Famous frames for signal processing include discrete Fourier transform, Gabor, wavelets, and curvelet transforms [6, 8, 9, 10].

Frame is a set of linearly independent vectors in the vector space that is spanned by the vectors. Any signal in the vector space can be represented as a linear combination of elements in the frame, where the coefficients (called decomposition coefficients or frame coefficients) are derived by applying the input product between the signal and elements in a dual frame. The dual frame associating with the frame for such a representation of the signal is not unique. A milestone of the frame theory is the construction of the canonical dual frame via the frame operator. If the signal space is finite-dimensional discrete vector space, the frame and the canonical dual frame have a connection to the pseudo-inverse and singular value decomposition in matrix linear algebra. Of interest is that the l_2-norm of the coefficients of a signal derived by the canonical dual frame is the minimizer of all coefficients of all dual frames. For frame ψ and signal y, the solution x_2^* of the l_2-minimization problem[1],

$$\begin{cases} \min_x \|x\| \\ y = \psi x, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

is $x_2^* = \phi_2^T y$, where ϕ_2 is the canonical dual frame of ψ, as shown in Figure 1(a).

Because of the emergence of sparse representation, the attention for signal representation has shifted from the l_2-minimization problem to the l_1-minimization problem [11, 12, 14]:

$$\begin{cases} \min_x \|x\|_1 \\ y = \psi x. \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

As opposed to the synthesis approach that regards the minimizer x_1^* as the sparse vector synthesized to y with dictionary ψ, in this paper, we investigate whether x_1^* can be derived by an analysis approach, or whether it can be derived by a dual frame of ψ.

[1] $\|..\|$ is short for $\|..\|_2$.

Our conclusion is that x_1^* cannot be derived by dual frame of $\psi \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times n}$ for $m > n$. However, we show that x_1^* can be derived in an alternative way than solving Equation (2). Let ϕ_1 be a dual frame of ψ and $\phi_1^T\psi$ satisfy some sufficient conditions for unique solution of sparse representation. The mutual incoherence [14, 15], the null space property [16], and the restricted isometry property (RIP) [20] are popular sufficient conditions for unique solution of sparse representation. Then, x_1^* is also the minimizer of

$$\begin{cases} \min \|x\|_1 \\ u = \phi_1^T\psi x \\ u = \phi_1^T y \\ \phi^T\psi \text{ holds property of deriving unique sparsest solution.} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Though the same minimizer is used in Equations (2) and (3), it is interpreted differently. In Equation (2), the minimizer synthesizes a signal, as shown in Figure 1(b); however, in Equation (3), it represents a coefficient vector u in transform domain, as shown in Figure 1(c). The efforts of the two approaches to deriving x_1^* are also different: one is through the synthesis operator ψ and the other via the reproducing kernel operator $\phi^T\psi$. If ψ is an over-complete frame, expressed as $n \times m$ matrix with $m > n$, then both the dimensions of the null spaces of $\phi_1^T\psi$ and ψ are $m - n$.

Our investigation implies that a foundation can be built that connects various applications seeking to optimize sparse synthesis coefficients (sparse problems) and sparse analysis coefficients (co-sparse problems). We show that the frame-based sparse representation is the link by presenting clear construction methods reducing co-sparse problems to sparse problems and vice versa for various applications.

Finally, we show that frames that meet conditions in problem (3) can be constructed. The frame is formed by composition of two matrices: one aims to satisfy the property for deriving unique sparse solution, and the other to allow freedom of appending another property. We demonstrate an example that requires the sparse decomposition coefficients. For which example, we demonstrate two designs of the dual frame, derived from a random matrix as well as a partial random matrix.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the frame theory. The main contributions are presented in Section 3 and are summarized as two theorems. Section 4 shows that, under the frame structure, various sparse and co-sparse problems result in equivalent formulations. Section 5 presents a general design approach for frame and dual frame that meet conditions in problem (3). Section 6

demonstrates an example showing that frames satisfying the conditions can also meet the requirement of deriving sparse decomposition coefficients. Section 7 gives the concluding remarks.

2 The Frame

Frame studies how to design a set of vectors $f_i \in V$, spanning the vector space by representing any $f \in V$ as

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{m} < f, \tilde{c}_i > f_i, \tag{4}$$

where $\tilde{c}_i$ and $< f, \tilde{c}_i >$ are called the dual frame and the frame coefficients of f_i, respectively. If the frame f_i is over-complete, there exists different choices of $\tilde{g}_i \neq \tilde{c}_i$ that

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{m} < f, \tilde{g}_i > f_i. \tag{5}$$

The frame operator S of a frame f_i, with $i = 1, \cdots, m$, is defined as

$$Sf = TT^T f, \tag{6}$$

where T^T maps signal f in V to coefficients in $\mathbb{C}^m$. In order that S has an inverse, it is required that the frame condition meets for any $f \in V$:

$$b\|f\|^2 \leq < f, Sf > = < f, TT^T f > = < T^T f, T^T f > \leq a\|f\|^2, \tag{7}$$

where $\infty > a \geq b > 0$ are frame bounds. If $a = b$, the frame is a tight one; and if $a = b = 1$, the frame is an orthonormal basis. Frame T can be expressed as a matrix of the form

$$T = [f_1, \cdots, f_m], \tag{8}$$

where inner product $< T^T f, T^T f >$ is evaluated by $\sum_{i=1}^{m} | < f, f_i > |^2$.

Much attention is on the construction of the canonical dual frame that is defined as the sequence $S^{-1}f_1, \cdots, S^{-1}f_m$, where S^{-1} is the inverse of the fame operator. The canonical dual frame satisfies the frame condition for any $f \in V$ with bounds a^{-1} and b^{-1}:

$$a^{-1}\|f\|^2 \leq < f, S^{-1}f > \leq b^{-1}\|f\|^2. \tag{9}$$



Figure 1: Frame ψ is given and it is used as the reconstruction (synthesis) operation. The decomposition (analysis) operation is the transpose of frame ϕ_i, where ϕ_1 is the frame for deriving l_1-minimizer and ϕ_2 is the canonical dual frame. (a) the coefficients $\phi_2^T y$ minimizes the l_2-norm of all frame coefficients in representing y. (b) the l_1-minimizer, x_1^*, can be derived synthetically as the sparse representation of signal y with reconstruction frame ψ. (c) the l_1-minimizer x_1^* can also be derived as the sparse representation of $u = \phi_1^T y$ with dictionary $\phi_1^T \psi$. Note that, as shown in (c), there is no arc leading to x_1^*, indicating that the minimizer cannot be reached directly through frame operations. Instead, it can be obtained via two indirect routes; one is shown in (b) as the sparse representation of the signal y, and the other as the sparse representation of the decomposition coefficients u.

Because $SS^{-1} = I$, f can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} f &= SS^{-1}f && (10)\\ &= TT^T S^{-1}f && (11)\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} < f_i, S^{-1}f > f_i && (12)\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} < f, S^{-1}f_i > f_i. && (13) \end{aligned}$$

Equation (13) is derived from the fact that S is self-adjoint (or symmetric); so does S^{-1}. The sequence $< f, S^{-1}f_i >$, obtained by $T^T S^{-1} : V \to \mathbb{C}^m$, is the (canonical) frame coefficients of f_i. $T^T S^{-1}$ and T are called the analysis and synthesis operations, respectively. The frame coefficients derived by the canonical dual frame is the solution of

$$\min_b \|b\| \quad (14)$$

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i f_i \text{ for all } f \in V, \quad (15)$$

with $b = [b_1 \cdots b_m]^T$. This sequence of coefficients has the smallest l_2-norm of all frame coefficients of f_i that represent signal f.

2.1 Frame in $\mathbb{C}^n$

Let the vector space V be the finite-dimensional vector space $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then, the synthesis operator

$$T : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n \quad (16)$$

is an $n \times m$ matrix, with $m \geq n$. If the matrix T has a (block) Toeplitz or circulant structure, it is also called the convolution operation. The frame theory is a guide to design filtering operations so that the decomposition filter and the reconstruction filter altogether forms a perfect reconstruction operation for any $f \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The frame operator S is a self-adjoint (symmetric) $n \times n$ matrix, with $SS^{-1} = I$.

$$\begin{aligned} f &= T(T^T S^{-1})f && (17)\\ &= S^{-1}T(T^T)f, && (18) \end{aligned}$$

where the operations in parentheses perform the decomposition task.

The matrix $T^T S^{-1}$ is the pseudo-inverse of T. Let $T^+ f$ denote $T^T S^{-1} f$, which is an m-dimensional vector with elements $< f, S^{-1} f_i >$. Since $T^T S^{-1} f$ minimizes the l_2-norm of all decomposition coefficients of f_i that represent f, $T^T S^{-1} f$ is the solution of

$$\min_x \|x\| \tag{19}$$

$$f = Tx. \tag{20}$$

And,

$$\begin{aligned} f &= TT^+ f \text{ (from Equation (17))} && (21)\\ &= TT^T (TT^T)^{-1} f && (22) \end{aligned}$$

implies that $T^+ = T^T (TT^T)^{-1} = T^T S^{-1}$. The frame S is therefore TT^T.

If the singular value decomposition (svd) of T is $U[\Sigma\ 0]V^T$, then the svd of T^+ takes the form $V[\Sigma^{-1}\ 0]^T U^T$, where U and V are $n \times n$ and $m \times m$ unitary matrices, respectively, and Σ is an $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with non-zero diagonal entries. The generalized pseudo-inverse of T is defined as $V[\Sigma^{-1}\ F]^T U^T$, where F is any $n \times (m-n)$ matrix. Let $\mathcal{R}_A$ denote the column space of the matrix A. The $n \times n$ matrix TT^+ and the $m \times m$ matrix T^+T are the unique self-adjoint orthogonal projections onto $\mathcal{R}_T$ and that of $\mathcal{R}_{T^T}$, respectively. In addition, T^+ is also the unique $m \times n$ matrix satisfying

$$TT^+T = T \text{ and } T^+TT^+ = T^+. \tag{23}$$

In some literature, T^+T is called the reproducing kernel.

If T is over-complete, it has no singular null space of dimension $m-n$, and the $m \times n$ matrix D is formed by any n vector in the null space of T. We have

$$\begin{aligned} f &= T(T^T S^{-1} + D)f && (24)\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} (< f, S^{-1} f_i > f_i + < f, d_i > f_i) && (25)\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} < f, S^{-1} f_i + d_i > f_i, && (26) \end{aligned}$$

where d_i is the i-th row of D, and $S^{-1} f_i + d_i$ is a dual frame of T. The dual frame of an over-complete frame is not unique.

3 Sparse Decomposition and Reconstruction

Given a frame, the minimizer of the l_2-norm of all frame coefficients of a signal is the canonical frame coefficient. We wonder whether there is a similar result for the minimizer of the l_1-norm. Specifically, we ask whether l_1-norm minimizer can be derived from a dual frame of the frame. At first glance, this question should have a positive answer because of the following theorem:

Theorem[7]: Let f_i be a frame for finite-dimension vector space V. Given $f \in V$, there exists coefficients $d_i \in \mathbb{C}^m$ such that

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i f_i, \tag{27}$$

and

$$\|d\|_1 = \inf\{d_i | f = \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i f_i\}. \tag{28}$$

For completeness, we prove it in Appendix A. Unfortunately, after investigation, we conclude that the answer is negative. The sparse minimizer does exit, but, generally, it cannot be derived from any dual frame. Nevertheless, we show that the sparse minimizer can be derived via solving a sparse representation problem, with producing kernel as the dictionary.

Let $\phi^T : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^m$ and $\psi : \mathbb{C}^m \to \mathbb{C}^n$, with $m \geq n$, be the decomposition (analysis) and reconstruction (synthesis) operations, respectively. We first highlight the interesting result of Nam et al.[21, 19]: if ϕ is a frame with the form of an $n \times m$ matrix and with columns ϕ_i in general positions (any set of at most n columns are linearly independent), then the number k of non-zero coefficients of $\phi^T y$, where y is the real-valued signal in $\mathbb{R}^n$, is at least $m - n + 1$. Since $m - k$ rows in $\phi^T y$ are zeros and these rows take at most $n - 1$ dimensions, $k \geq m - n + 1$. For $m > n$, this result excludes the chance that $\phi^T y$ is sparse for any k.

In the following, we show a similar result that forfeits the existence of an over-complete frame ϕ satisfies for all signal y that

$$y = \psi x, \tag{29}$$

$$x = \phi^T y, \tag{30}$$

where x is a k-sparse vector and ψ is a dual frame of ϕ.

Theorem 1: Let the $n \times m$ matrix $\phi = [\phi_1 \cdots \phi_m]$ be a frame in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with columns ϕ_i in general positions. ϕ is a dual frame of ψ; thus, $\psi\phi^T = I$. Suppose that

$k \geq m - n + 1$. Then, for $m > n$, there exists no pair of ϕ and ψ that meets the conditions (29) and (30) for all k-sparse x and signal y.

Proof. Suppose that there is a pair of frame ψ and dual frame ϕ satisfying conditions (29) and (30) for all pairs of signal y and corresponding k-sparse vector x. Without loss of generality, we suppose the indices of non-zero coefficients of x are at $1, \cdots, k$. Because $y = \psi x$, y is in the subspace spanned by $\psi_1, \cdots, \psi_k$ (denoted as $V_a^{\psi}(k)$). Meanwhile, because $x = \phi^T y$, y is in the subspace spanned by $\phi_1, \cdots, \phi_k$ (denoted as $V_a^{\phi}(k)$), as well as in the subspace perpendicular to that spanned by the rest $m - k$ vectors (denoted as $V_b^{\phi}(m-k)^{\perp}$). Hence,

$$y \in V_a^{\psi}(k) \cap V_a^{\phi}(k) \cap V_b^{\phi}(m-k)^{\perp}. \tag{31}$$

The result of Nam et al. indicates that to have a non-empty intersection of $V_a^{\phi}(k)$ and $V_b^{\phi}(m-k)^{\perp}$, k must be at least $m-n+1$. Because the set of signal y satisfying Equation (31) is a vector space of dimension k ($y = \psi x$ and the bottom $m - k$ elements in x are zeros.), the dimension of $V_b^{\phi}(m-k)$ is $n - k$.

Let $\phi = [\phi_a \ \phi_b]$ and $\psi = [\psi_a \ \psi_b]$, where $\phi_a = [\phi_1 \cdots \phi_k]$, $\phi_b = [\phi_{k+1} \cdots \phi_m]$, $\psi_a = [\psi_1 \cdots \psi_k]$, and $\psi_b = [\psi_{k+1} \cdots \psi_m]$. Because of Equations (29) and (30), we have

$$x = \phi^T \psi x. \tag{32}$$

Therefore, $\phi_b^T \psi_a x_1 = 0_{m-k}$ and $\phi_a^T \psi_a x_1 = x_1$, where x_1 is the first k elements in x. Since $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is arbitrary, we have

$$\phi_b^T \psi_a = 0_{m-k,k}; \tag{33}$$

$$\phi_a^T \psi_a = I_{k,k}. \tag{34}$$

Corresponding to Equations (33) and (34) are $V_b^{\phi}(m-k) \perp V_a^{\psi}(k)$ and $V_a^{\phi}(k) = V_a^{\psi}(k)$, respectively. Putting the results of Equations (33) and (34) together with the fact that the dimensions of $V_b^{\phi}(m-k)$ and $V_a^{\psi}(k)$ are $n-k$ and k, respectively,

$$V_a^{\psi}(k) = V_a^{\phi}(k) = V_b^{\phi}(m-k)^{\perp}. \tag{35}$$

From the fact that the dimension spanned by the $m - k$ columns in ϕ_b is $n - k$; $m - k = n - k + (m - n)$. Because $m - n > 0$, we can deduce that there exists a set of $n - k + 1$ vectors in ϕ_b spanning a dimension $n - k$ subspace. This violates the assumption that ϕ_i are in general positions. Q.E.D.

Matrices ψ and ϕ that satisfy conditions (29) and (30) do exist for m being equal to n.

Proposition 1: Let $m = n$, and let matrices ψ and ϕ meet conditions (29) and (30) for all $k \geq 1$. Then $\psi_i = c_i \phi_i$, where c_i are scalars for $i = 1, \cdots, m$.

Proof. This can be verified from Equations (33), (34), and (35) by mathematical induction. When $k = 1$, it is obviously correct. Let us assume that the proposition is correct up to $k = l$. Then,

$$\psi_i = c_i \phi_i \text{ for } i = 1, \cdots, l; \tag{36}$$

$$\phi_{l+1}, \cdots, \phi_n \in V_a^{\phi}(l)^{\perp} \text{ and } \phi_{l+1}, \cdots, \phi_n \in V_a^{\psi}(l)^{\perp}; \tag{37}$$

where Equation (37) is from Equations (33) and (35).

For $k = l+1$, Equation (35) indicates that $V_a^{\psi}(l+1) = V_a^{\phi}(l+1) = V_b^{\phi}(n-l-1)^{\perp}$. Together with $\phi_{l+1} \perp V_a^{\phi}(l)$ and $\phi_{l+1} \perp V_a^{\psi}(l)$ and $V_a^{\psi}(l) = V_a^{\phi}(l)$, we can conclude that $\psi_{l+1} = c_{l+1}\phi_{l+1}$. Q.E.D.

Conditions (29) and (30) indicate that x is simultaneously sparse with respect to the synthesis operation as well as the analysis operation. This theorem excludes the chance for over-complete frames ψ and ϕ to meet the conditions. It also generally excludes the chance of deriving the minimizer of the l_1-optimization problem via a dual frame. Thus, we take an alternative route that preserves the design condition (29) but replaces the condition (30) by

$$u = \phi^T y; \tag{38}$$

$$\phi^T \psi \text{ satisfies property of deriving unique sparsest solution.} \tag{39}$$

Specifically, we require no sparse coefficients from "direct" decomposition of y. Instead, we impose on the reproducing kernel $\phi^T \psi$ the condition of deriving unique sparsest solution. Because the dimension of the null space of the kernel is $m - n$, the sparse vector x can be derived from u via $\phi^T \psi$. Because u is generated with the intention to yield x, u is called the proxy of x.

Theorem 2: Let ψ be a frame and ϕ be a dual frame of ψ; thus, $\psi \phi^T = I$. If ϕ and ψ satisfy conditions (29), (38) and (39), then the l_1-optimization problem can be solved.

Proof. Let y be a real-valued signal in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $u = \phi^T y$ be the frame coefficients in

$\mathbb{C}^m$, and let x_1^* be the minimizer of

$$\min_x \|x\|_1 \tag{40}$$

$$u = \phi^T \psi x. \tag{41}$$

x_1^* is unique because $\phi^T \psi$ satisfies conditions for deriving unique sparse solution. In addition, from both x_1^* and u, the signal y can be reconstructed as

$$y = \psi u = \psi \phi^T \psi x_1^* = \psi x_1^*, \tag{42}$$

where the first equality is because $u = \phi^T y$ and $\psi \phi^T = I$, the second equality is Equation (41), and the last equality is $\psi \phi^T = I$. As a result, x_1^* is also the unique minimizer of

$$\min_x \|x\|_1 \tag{43}$$

$$y = \psi x. \tag{44}$$

Q.E.D.

Though the same minimizer x_1^* is derived from both Equations (41) and (44), the meanings of the minimizer derived by each equation are different. The minimizer of Equation (41) is another representation of decomposition coefficients u, whereas that of Equation (44) is a sparse vector that reconstructs the signal y. Based on this theorem, the following procedure is presented to derive the minimizer x_1^* from frames. Signal y is first decomposed to obtain coefficients u, followed by seeking a sparse vector representing u. The sparse solution is the minimizer x_1^*.

Theorem 1 indicates that for any over-complete frame, no dual frame can achieve sparse decomposition for any signal. In contrast, Theorem 2 indicates that the sparse decomposition can be indirectly achieved via solving a sparse representation with reproducing kernel as the dictionary, provided the pair of frames satisfy conditions (29), (38) and (39). Before demonstrating frames satisfies the conditions in Section 5, we discuss the implication of frame-based sparse representation approach on applications in the next section.

4 Equivalent Optimization Problems

We show that, under the frame structure, various applications formulated based on sparse synthesis coefficients [17] and sparse analysis coefficients result in equivalent formulations.

A. Denoising

An observation is obtained by adding noise to a signal. The intention is to recover the signal x from the observation y:

$$y = x + n, \tag{45}$$

where n is a noise.

Synthesis model:

$$\begin{cases} \min_u \|u\|_1 \\ y = x + n \\ x = \psi u. \end{cases} \tag{46}$$

The synthesis problem tries to recover a signal of the sparsest synthesis coefficients.

Analysis model:

$$\begin{cases} \min_x \|\phi^T x\|_1 \\ y = x + n. \end{cases} \tag{47}$$

The analysis problem aims to recover a signal of the sparsest analysis coefficients.

Comparing problems (46) and (47), the analysis operation is implicit in synthesis model; in contrast, the synthesis operation is implicit in analysis model. A bridge, founded by the frame theory, will be built to explore each implicit operation in respective problem as well as demonstrate that both problems have equivalent expressions.

Theorem 1 indicates that if ψ and ϕ are frame and dual frame, then there is a signal, named $\tilde{x}$, such that the sparsest synthesis coefficients and the sparsest analysis coefficients of the signal are different. In frame structure, because $\psi\phi^T = I$, analysis coefficients of a signal is also coincident with synthesis coefficients of the signal. Therefore, the solutions of problems (46) and (47) do not coincide with each other for signal $\tilde{x}$. The optimum analysis solution consistent with that of synthesis solution can be obtained via the alternative route by replacing $\min_x \|\phi^T x\|_1$ with

$$\begin{cases} \min_u \|u\|_1 \\ \phi^T x = \phi^T \psi u. \quad . \end{cases} \tag{48}$$

In consequence, the correct optimization for analysis model is

$$\begin{cases} \min_u \|u\|_1 \\ y = x + n \\ \phi^T x = \phi^T \psi u. \end{cases} \tag{49}$$

Surprisingly, this is exactly the optimization problem for synthesis model, provided the equation $\phi^T x = \phi^T \psi u$ is appended to problem (46).

Problem (49) converges the synthesis and analysis noise reduction models. Being a special case of noise reduction problem by setting noise to zero, the analysis and synthesis sparse representation problems can certainly be reduced to an equivalent formulation as well.

B. Linear Restoration

This model has the following form:

$$y = Hx + n, \tag{50}$$

where y is the observation, x is the signal, and n is the noise. The $m \times n$ matrix H can be a sensing matrix of compressed sensing, which projects x into m linear measurements. The matrix H can also be a distortion operation that covers, for example, the deblurring problem (H is a square matrix of $\|H\|_2 \leq 1$), the inpainting problem (some rows in H are zeros), and the down-sampling problem (H of size $m < n$ is a down-sampling operation).

Synthesis model:

The goal is to recover the sparsest coefficients of the observation, with respect to the frame dictionary ψ.

$$\begin{cases} \min_u \|u\|_1 \\ y = H\psi u + n \\ x = \psi u, \end{cases} \tag{51}$$

where n is the noise and y is the noisy observation.

Analysis model:

The analysis problem aims to derive a signal with the sparsest analysis coefficients:

$$\begin{cases} \min \|\phi^T x\|_1 \\ y = Hx + n. \end{cases} \tag{52}$$

The synthesis operation is implicit in analysis model. However, using the same approach as demonstrated in Equation (48), problem (52) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \min_u \|u\|_1 \\ y = H\psi u + n \\ \phi^T x = \phi^T \psi u \\ x = \psi u. \end{cases} \tag{53}$$

On the other hand, if we apply the analysis operation ϕ^T to the last equation in problem (51), and append the result to the synthesis problem, we have the analysis problem. Thus, the analysis and synthesis models converge and coincide with each other.

C. Signal Separation

An observation is modelled as a superposition of several subcomponents and the separation problem is to restore each of the subcomponents from the observation. Without loss of generalization, we investigate the case of two subcomponents.

Synthesis model:

This separation model is also called the morphological component analysis (MCA) [18], which tries to separate y into the superposition of two subcomponents x_1 and x_2 with different morphological structures, encoded in sparse coefficients u_1 and u_2 of respective dictionary ψ_1 and ψ_2:

$$\begin{cases} \min_{u_i} \|u_1\|_1 + \|u_2\|_1 \\ y = x_1 + x_2 + n \\ x_1 = \psi_1 u_1 \\ x_2 = \psi_2 u_2. \end{cases} \tag{54}$$

If equations $\phi_i^T x_i = \phi_i^T \psi_i u_i$ with $i = 1, 2$ are added to problem (54) , then we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \min_{u_i} \|u_1\|_1 + \|u_2\|_1 \\ y = x_1 + x_2 + n \\ x_1 = \psi_1 u_1 \\ x_2 = \psi_2 u_2. \\ \phi_1^T x_1 = \phi_1^T \psi_1 u_1 \\ \phi_2^T x_2 = \phi_1^T \psi_1 u_2. \end{cases} \tag{55}$$

Analysis model:

We define the analysis separation problem as

$$\begin{cases} \min_{x_i} \|\phi_1^T x_1\|_1 + \|\phi_2^T x_2\|_1 \\ y = x_1 + x_2 + n \\ x_1 = \psi_1 u_1 \\ x_2 = \psi_2 u_2. \end{cases} \tag{56}$$

This problem separates y according to the sparse analysis coefficients x_1 and x_2. In contrast to the MCA problem, we refer to the analysis counterpart as the co-

morphological component analysis (Co-MCA)[2]. The Co-MCA problem can be immediately reduced to the MCA problem by replacing the objective function $\min_{x_i} \sum_i \|\phi_i^T x_i\|_1$ in problem (56) with

$$\begin{cases} \min_{u_i} \sum_i \|u_i\|_1 \\ \phi_i^T x_i = \phi_i^T \psi_i u_i. \end{cases} \tag{57}$$

5 Construction

We proceed to design frames ϕ and ψ, both of dimensions $n \times m$, with $m \geq n$, that meet conditions (29), (38) and (39). For purpose of demonstration, $\phi^T\psi$ is constructed to meet the RIP property for unique sparse representation, as required by Equation (39). Let $\phi_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\psi_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be columns of ϕ and ψ, respectively. ψ_i is set up to be the canonical dual frame of ϕ_i: $\psi_i = S^{-1}\phi_i$ and S^{-1} is the inverse of the frame operator $S = \phi\phi^T$. The following properties are resulted from the frame theory:

$$\psi\phi^T = I; \tag{58}$$

$$\phi^T = \psi^+; \tag{59}$$

$$\phi^T\psi\phi^T = \phi^T; \tag{60}$$

$$\psi\phi^T\psi = \psi; \tag{61}$$

$$\phi^T\psi \text{ is the orthogonal projection of } \mathbb{R}^m \text{ onto } \mathbb{R}_{\phi^T}. \tag{62}$$

Equation (59) is derived from $\psi\psi^T(\psi\psi^T)^{-1} = I$ and $\psi^T(\psi\psi^T)^{-1}$ is the pseudo inverse of ψ. If $u = \phi^T\psi x$, where x is a k-sparse vector, then u and x are mapped to the same point in the range space of ϕ^T, as $\phi^T\psi u = \phi^T\psi x$ and $\phi^T\psi$ is an orthogonal projection. The RIP property of $\phi^T\psi$ is defined as the following holds. There exists a restricted isometry constant $\delta_k \in [0, 1)$ for sparsity level k such that for any k-sparse vector x that

$$(1 - \delta_k)\|x\|^2 \leq \|\phi^T\psi x\|^2 \leq (1 + \delta_k)\|x\|^2. \tag{63}$$

The RIP property [20] implies that if δ_k is very small, then $\phi^T\psi$ is almost a linear isometry that preserves the distance of each pair of $\frac{k}{2}$-sparse vectors. As a result, the sparse vector x can be stably recovered from $\phi^T\psi x$ [22].

[2]It is suggested to investigate the number of zero analysis coefficients (co-sparsity) of a signal in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for synthesis problems, as this number can be freely from 0 to $n - 1$ [19].

To separate the RIP property and maintain a preferable transform domain, the decomposition operation ϕ^T is defined as $A^T G$, the composition of matrices A^T and G, where the $m \times n$ matrix A^T satisfies $AA^T = I$ and the $n \times n$ matrix G is full rank with normalized column norm. The norm of each column of ϕ^T is therefore normalized because

$$(A^T g_i)^T (A^T g_i) = g_i^T A A^T g_i = \|g_i\|^2 = 1, \tag{64}$$

where g_i is the i-th column of G. The following properties can be immediately derived:

$$S = \phi\phi^T = G^T G \succ 0 \quad \text{(The frame operator is positive definite.)} \tag{65}$$

$$\psi = S^{-1}\phi = G^{-1}A; \tag{66}$$

$$\phi^T \psi = A^T A. \tag{67}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} < \phi^T\psi x, \phi^T\psi x > &= < (\phi^T\psi)^2 x, x > &(68)\\ &= < \phi^T\psi x, x > &(69)\\ &= < A^T A x, x > &(70)\\ &= < Ax, Ax >, &(71) \end{aligned}$$

where Equations (68) and (69) can be verified by $(\phi^T\psi)^2 = \phi^T\psi$ and $\psi^T\phi = \phi^T\psi$, the matrix A also holds the RIP property with the same RIC value as that of $\phi^T\psi$. Because the RIP property of $\phi^T\psi$ is inherited by A, the matrix G can then be mainly used for representation purpose. Various design targets can be optimally designed by imposing criteria on A and G. Let us take the example in the following section as a demonstration.

6 Example: Sparse Decomposition Coefficients

We intend to derive a frame ϕ for which the number of non-zero decomposition coefficients $\phi^T y$ is as small as possible for all y. This target corresponds to seek A and G as the solution of

$$\min_{A^T G; \|y\|=1} \|A^T G y\|_1, \tag{72}$$

where y is on the unit ball; otherwise, the value of above optimization could have been arbitrarily small. By using the norm inequality that

$$\|Bx\|_1 \leq \|B\|_{1,1}\|x\|_1, \tag{73}$$

where $\|B\|_{1,1} := \max_{\|x\|_1=1} \|Bx\|_1$, we obtain $\|A^T Gy\|_1 \leq \|A^T G\|_{1,1}\|y\|_1$. $\|B\|_{1,1}$ for matrix $B = [b_1 \cdots b_n]$ is defined as, [23],

$$\max\{\|b_1\|_1, \cdots, \|b_n\|_1\}. \tag{74}$$

Since $\|y\|_1 \leq \sqrt{n}\|y\|$ (l_1-norm and l_2-norm inequlity), n is given, and $\|y\| = 1$, we can instead minimize the upper bound of Equation (72) by

$$\min_{A^T G} \|A^T G\|_{1,1}. \tag{75}$$

This optimization can be related to the maximum absolute value of cross inner product between columns of A and G. Because $\|b_i\|_1 \leq m\|b_i\|_\infty$ (the maximum absolute value in vector b_i), we have

$$\|B\|_{1,1} = \max\{\|b_1\|_1, \cdots, \|b_n\|_1\} \leq m \max_{i,j} |b_{i,j}|. \tag{76}$$

Let $A = [a_1 \cdots a_m]$ and $G = [g_1 \cdots g_n]$. Then,

$$\max_{i,j} |(A^T G)_{i,j}| = \max_{i,j} |a_i^T g_j|. \tag{77}$$

Note that $\max |a_i^T g_j|$ is not the mutual coherence between matrices A and S as the norm of a_i is not necessarily normalized. In consequence of Equations (75)(76)(77), we have

$$\min_{A^T G} \|A^T G\|_{1,1} \leq m \min_{A,G} \max_{i,j} |a_i^T g_j|. \tag{78}$$

Because each column of $A^T G$ is normalized, the maximum absolute value in column j is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \leq \max_i |a_i^T g_j| \leq 1$. Hence,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \leq \max_{i,j} |a_i^T g_j| \leq 1. \tag{79}$$

The bounds of Equation (79) can be applied to deterministic matrices A and G.

6.1 Design of A and G

Putting together the desired conditions in Section 5 and the objective in Equation (78), we can formulate the following optimization problem for A and G:

$$\min_{A,G} \max_{i,j} |a_i^T g_j| \tag{80}$$

$$AA^T = I; \tag{81}$$

$$A \text{ holds the RIP property;} \tag{82}$$

$$G^T G \succ 0; \tag{83}$$

$$\text{Each column of } G \text{ is normalized.} \tag{84}$$

We present two design approaches for the optimization problem: A is a structured random matrix in design approach 1, and it is a random matrix in design approach 2.

A. Design approach 1:

In this approach, A is a random matrix constructed from a discrete orthonormal system. Let $R_n B$ be a sampling operator randomly taking n rows from matrix B and each row is selected without repetition [24, 23]. The $n \times m$ matrix A is constructed by

$$A = R_n \tilde{A}, \tag{85}$$

where $\tilde{A}$ is an $m \times m$ orthonormal matrix. It has been shown that A can hold the RIP property with high probability if n is sufficiently large [23]. In addition, A^T is linear isometry, since $AA^T = R_n \tilde{A} \tilde{A}^T R_n^T = R_n R_n^T = I$.

If we choose G to be an orthonormal matrix, then the column norm of ϕ_i (the i-th column of ϕ) is $\phi_i^T \phi_i = a_i^T G G^T a_i = \|a_i\|^2$ (a_i is the i-th column of A), and column norm of ψ_i (the i-th column of ψ) is $\psi_i^T \psi_i = (G^{-1} a_i)^T G^{-1} a_i = \|a_i\|^2$.

Note that if $\tilde{A}$ is the Fourier basis, with (l,k)-th element being $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} e^{2\pi i l k/m}$, and G is the identity matrix, then $\max_{i,j} |a_i^T g_j| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$. According to Equation (79), this design has achieved the optimal lower bound.

B. Design approach 2:

In this approach, A is a random matrix, with entries sampled from independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) Gaussian random variable, $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$. It has been shown that A can satisfy the RIP with high probability when n is sufficiently

large[3][25] and $\mathbb{E}\{AA^T\} = m\sigma^2 I$. If G is an orthonormal matrix, the expected norm of each column ϕ_i in ϕ is $\mathbb{E}\{a_i^T a_i\} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma^2 = n\sigma^2$. If σ is set at $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$, the expected norm of each column is $\frac{n}{m}$, and $\mathbb{E}\{AA^T\} = I$.

We now study the properties of the maximum absolute cross inner product between A and G. Because G is an orthonormal matrix, $A^T G$ is an i.i.d. Gaussian random matrix. The (i,j)-th element in $A^T G$ is $a_i^T g_j$, where a_i and g_j are the i-th and j-th columns of A and G, respectively. Since each element of a_i is sampled from i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$ and g_j is normalized, $a_i^T g_j$ is also an i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$ because

$$\mathbb{E}\{(a_i^T g_j)^T a_i^T g_j\} = g_j^T \mathbb{E}\{a_i a_i^T\} g_j = \frac{1}{m}. \tag{86}$$

Hence, $A^T G$ is a $m \times n$ random matrix with entries sampled i.i.d. from $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$. Let $X_{i,j}$ denote the (i,j)-th element of $A^T G$. The tail probability of $X_{i,j}$ can be estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|X_{i,j}| \geq u) &= \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{m}|X_{i,j}| \geq \sqrt{m}u) && (87)\\
&= 2\int_{u\sqrt{m}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-t^2/2} dt && (88)\\
&\leq 2\min\{\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}u}\} e^{-mu^2/2}, && (89)\\
&= \min\{\sqrt{2\pi}, \frac{2}{\sqrt{m}u}\} e^{-mu^2/2}, && (90)
\end{aligned}$$

where Equation (88) is obtained because $\sqrt{m}X_{i,j}$ is $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ and Equation (90) is obtained from [23][4]. The term $\frac{2}{\sqrt{m}u}$ in Equation (90) is chosen as $u > \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}$. Let $u = \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{m}}$ with $\alpha > 1.1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\max_{i,j} |X_{i,j}| < \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{m}}) &= \prod_{i,j} (1 - \mathbb{P}(|X_{i,j}| \geq \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{m}})) && (91)\\
&\geq (1 - \frac{2}{\alpha} e^{-\alpha^2/2})^{mn}, && (92)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is obtained by substituting the result of Equation (90). The approximate root α for equation $\frac{2}{\alpha} e^{\frac{-\alpha^2}{2}} = 1$ is 1.1 and any value α smaller than 1.1 renders a probability greater than 1. Figure 2 shows the probability of the event $\max_{i,j} |X_{i,j}| < \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{m}}$ for various m and α by setting $m = 2n$. The probability of the event is about $[\frac{3}{\sqrt{m}}, \frac{6}{\sqrt{m}}]$. Compared to the optimal bound $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$ for deterministic matrix A, the efficiency of random matrix is obvious.

[3]Precisely, for n in the order of $k \log m$ and for all k-sparse vector x, $\mathbb{P}(|\|A\|^2 - \|x\|^2| \geq \delta_k \|x\|^2) \leq ce^{-\gamma n \delta_k^2}$, where δ_k is restricted isometry constant (RIC), γ, c are positive numerical constants.

[4]Q-function in Equation (88) has a tighter bound in [26].

7 Conclusion

Frame is the foundation for design decomposition and reconstruction operations in signal processing. If a synthesis frame is chosen for reconstruction, the canonical dual frame is the analysis frame that performs decomposition and yields coefficients that minimizes l_2-norm from all dual frames. This paper investigates the frame design so that a sparse vector, obtained applying decomposition on a signal, is also the sparse solution of representing the signal with the reconstruction. Unfortunately, we show such a dual frame does not exist for over-complete case. Then, we present conditions for frames so that the sparse vector that minimizes the l_1-norm for frame coefficients can be derived. However, the sparse vector is not obtained directly from a dual frame. Instead, it is obtained via a sparse representation with the reproducing kernel as the dictionary. Based on frame structure, we show that various problems seeking for optimum sparse synthesis and sparse analysis coefficients are equivalent. Finally, we demonstrate that the frames that can derive the sparse vector minimizing the l_1-norm of decomposition coefficients can be constructed and customized to meet other goals.

A Appendix

We give the proof of Theorem [7]. Let $r = [r_1 \cdots r_m]^T$ be the vector of the canonical frame coefficients. Since we want to minimize the l_1-norm of d_i where $f = \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i f_i$. It is clear that we can restrict our search on d_i on the compact set: $\{d = [d_1 \cdots d_m]^T | f = \sum_i d_i f_i \text{ and } d_i \leq \|r\|_1\}$. Since l_1-norm function is continuous, the minimizer of a continuous function on a compact set exists. Q.E.D.



Figure 2: The probability of the event: $\max_{i,j} |X_{i,j}| < \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{m}}$. $(1-\frac{2}{\alpha}e^{-\alpha^2/2})^{mn}$ is plotted with $m = 2n$ with various m and α values. m is in vertical axis and displayed in logarithmic scale. If α fixed, the probability decreases, as m increase; on the other hand, if m fixed, the probability increases, as α increases. For the range from 10^1 to 10^4 of m , the range of α forms the transition boundary from a low probability to a high probability is about from 3 to 6. After this range, the event probability is close to 1. This implies that high probability of $\max_{i,j} |X_{i,j}|$ is concentrated on small interval of $\frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{m}}$ with $3 \leq \alpha \leq 6$.

References

[1] A. Oppenheim nd A. Willsky, "*Signals and analysis*", Prentice Hall, 1997.

[2] G. Strang and T. Nguyen, "*Wavelets and filter banks*", Wellesley-Cambridge Press, 1996.

[3] S. Mallat, "*The wavelet tour of signal processing*", Academic Press, 2008.

[4] J. Duffin and A. Schaeffer, "A class of nonharmonic Fourier series", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 1052, pp.341-366.

[5] R. Young, "*An Introduction to nonharmonic Fourier series*", Academic Press, 1980.

[6] I. Duabechies, "*Ten lectures on wavelets*", SIAM, 1992.

[7] O. Christensen, "*Frames and bases: an introductory course*", Birkhauser, 2008.

[8] I. Daubechies, A. Grossmann, and Y. Meyer, "Painless nonorthogonal expansions", *J. Math. Phys.* , 27, pp. 1271-1283, 1986.

[9] I. Daubechies, "The wavelet transform, time-frequency localization and signal analysis", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 36, pp.605-612, 1990.

[10] E. Candes, and D. Donoho, "Curvelets: a surprising effective nonadaptive representation for objects with edges", *Curves and Surface Fitting* (Edited by Cohen, Rabut, Schumaker), Vanderbilt University Press, pp. 105-120, 2000.

[11] S. Chen, D. Donoho, and M. Saunders, "Atomic Decomposition by Basic Pursuit", *SIAM Review*, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp.129-159, Apr. 2006.

[12] E. Candes, J. Romberg, and T. Tao, "Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, Vol.52, Feb. 2006, pp.489-509.

[13] D. Donoho, "Compressed sensing", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, Vol.52, No.4, Apr. 2001, pp.1289-1306.

[14] D. Donoho, M. Elad, and V. Temlyakev "Stable recovery of sparse overcomplete representations in presence of noise", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, Vol. 52, num. 1, pp.6-18, Oct. 2006.

[15] J. Tropp, "Greedy is good: algorithmic results for sparse representation", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, Vol. 50, num. 10, pp.2231-2242, Oct. 2004.

[16] A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, and R. Devore, "Compressed sensign and best k-term approximation", *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 22, pp. 211-231, 2009.

[17] M. Zibulevsky and M. Elad, "L1-L2 Optimization in Signal and Image Processing", *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, pp. 76-88, May 2010.

[18] M. Elad, J. Starck, P. Querre, and D. Donoho, "Simultaneous cartoon and texture image inpainting using morphological component analysis (MCA)", *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 340-358, Nov. 2005.

[19] S. Nam, M. Davies, M. Elad, and R.Gribonval, "The coparse analysis and model and algorithms", *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* , 34(1), pp.30-56, Feb. 2003.

[20] E. Candes and T. Tao, "Decoding by Linear Programming", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, Vol.51, NO.12, pp.4203-4215, Dec 2005.

[21] S. Nam, M. Davies, M. Elad, and R.Gribonval, "Cosparse analysis modeling - uniqueness and algorithms", *IEEE ICASSP*, 2001.

[22] E. Candes, "The restricted isometry property and its implications for compressed sensing", *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, Serie I, 346: 2008, pp.589592.

[23] H. Rauhut, "Compressive Sensing and Structured Random Matrices", *Radon Series Comp. Appl. Math XX*, Vol.9, pp.1-92, 2010.

[24] E. Candes, J. Romberg and T. Tao, "Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements", *Comm. Pire Appl. Math.*, 59 (2006), pp.480-509.

[25] R. Baraniuk, M. Davenport, R. DeVore, and M. Wakin, "A simple proof of the restricted isometry property for random matrices", *Constructive Approximation*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 253263, 2008.

[26] G. Karagiannidis and A. Lioumpas, "An improved approximation for the Gaussian Q-function", *IEEE Communications Letters*, 11(8), 2007, pp.644-646.

.